

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached set of drawings (2 pages) includes changes to Figure 2 to eliminate the overlapping text in order to enhance the legibility of the figure. No amendments have been made to the other figures in this application.

Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added.

Remarks

Claims 1-13 were pending. Claims 9 and 10 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 11 is amended. Claims 14-17 have been added. Support for the amendments can be found in the specification, *inter alia*, at page 4, lines 21-37; page 8, lines 1-32; page 9, lines 31-36; and Figs. 1-4. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added. Thus, claims 1-8 and 10-21 are now pending.

Based on the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the outstanding rejections and passage of the claims to allowance.

Statement of the Interview

On September 12, 2010, Examiner Walter F. Briney III conducted a personal interview with the undersigned and Attorney Gregg Rosenblatt as Applicants' representatives. The differences between amended claim 1, as outlined above, and the prior art cited in the current office action were discussed. Applicants thank Examiner Briney for the constructive interview.

§ 102 Rejections

Claims 9-11 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sinclair et al. (US Publ. No. 2002/0118820 A1).

Claim 9 and claim 10 have been cancelled. The dependency of claim 11 has been changed to depend from new claim 16 which depends from claim 1.

Sinclair et al. teaches an electronic assembly in the form of a high density digital subscriber line (DSL) splitter to increase the total number of splitters that may be provided at a central office having a fixed amount of space. The subrack housing of the preferred splitter is dimensioned to fit within a standard nineteen or twenty-three inch electronic rack. In its most basic form, Sinclair et al.'s DSL splitter includes a subrack housing, plurality of splitter cards disposed within the housing between, a connector card at the back of the housing to external connections and an edge card that provide an electrical communication between the external connectors of the connector card and the splitter cards.

In contrast, Applicants provide an assembly of telecommunication cross connect modules configured to receive splitter circuits on the rear side of the assembly. Telecommunication

modules such as those described in the present disclosure are typically located on the main distribution frame in a central office. Thus, the Applicants' assembly allows the splitter circuits to be moved out of secondary racks and onto the MDF eliminating the need for a secondary rack structure and saving space within the central office.

Further, Sinclair et al. does not teach or disclose Applicants' assembly of three telecommunication modules and a number of splitter circuits wherein the number of splitter circuits being equal to half of the number of contacts of each module and wherein one third of the contacts of the assembly being adapted to transmit a line signal, one third of the contacts of the assembly being adapted to transmit a POTS signal, and one third of the contacts of the assembly being adapted to transmit a DSLAM-signal as described by Applicants' claim 1 from which claim 11 depends.

For at least these reasons, the rejection of claims 9-11 under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sinclair et al. has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

§ 103 Rejections

Claims 1-5 and 13 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arias (US Publ. No. 2005/0063531 A1) in view of Schmokel (US Publ. No. 2003/0002641 A1), and further in view of Sinclair et al. (US Publ. No. 2002/0118820 A1)

Arias discloses a broadband connection apparatus in Fig. 7 that includes two connection blocks having four rows of contacts. One row of contacts of connection block 1 is used for the incoming voice signal and the second row of contacts is used for the combined voice and data signal. One row of contacts of the second connection block 1' is used for the DSLAM signal and the second row on the second connection block remain free to act as a grounding point or test access point. Thus, Arias' broadband connection apparatus requires four rows of contacts. Additionally, the filters or splitters, preferably being individual filters, are connected externally to the front side of a connection block(s) on the intermediate distribution frame.

In contrast, Applicants' amended claim 1 describes an assembly comprising three telecommunications modules each having an equal number of contacts for connecting wires at a front side of the modules, the assembly further comprising splitter circuits, wherein the assembly is open at a rear side thereof and configured to receive the splitter circuits from the rear side and wherein the number of splitter circuits being equal to half of the number of contacts of each

module, one third of the contacts of the assembly configured to transmit a line signal, one third of the contacts of the assembly configured to transmit a POTS signal, and one third of the contacts of the assembly configured to transmit a DSLAM-signal.

Schmokel and Sinclair et al. both describe a splitter assembly which are located in a rack or cabinet separate from the main distribution frame in the central office (Schmokel ¶[0034], ¶[0038], and ¶[0039]; and Sinclair et al. ¶[0014]). These remote splitter assemblies are attached to the telecommunication modules on the MDF by separate cable assemblies. In contrast, Applicants' splitters are installed directly on the back side of the telecommunication assembly as described in amended claim 1.

The combination of Arias with either Schmokel or Sinclair et al. does not disclose or suggest the telecommunication assembly recited in Applicants' amended claim 1.

Claims 6-8 and 12 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arias in view of Schmokel in view of Sinclair et al., and further in view of Vernon (US 5,800,187).

Vernon et al. discloses a connection strip for high data rate lines which includes a grounding collector/strip mounted on the rear face of the connection strip. The connection strip is pivotally mounted on a carrier. The connection strip includes two rows of successive sets of 3 electrical contacts on the front side of the strip. One row relates to the incoming lines which are connected to out going lines or jumpers in the second row of contacts. In each set of 3 contacts, one contact is for the ring signal; one contact is for the tip signal and the third contact provides a grounding contact for connection to the grounding connector located on the rear side of the connection strip. The connection strip of Vernon does not accommodate connections for incoming voice signals, incoming data signals and outgoing combined signals (voice plus data) as is required for xDSL compatible telecommunication assemblies.

As previously outlined, Arias et al. in view of Schmokel in view of Sinclair et al. does not disclose or suggest the telecommunication assembly recited in Applicants' amended claim 1. The additional 35 USC § 103(a) arguments with respect to Vernon et al. made in the office action do not overcome the fundamental defects in the rejection of claim 1 as described above and are not relied on to do so. Therefore, for at least the reasons above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 6-8 and 12, which depend from amended claim 1, are patentable over Arias in

view of Schmokel in view of Sinclair, and further in view of Vernon. Applicants therefore request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

For at least these reason above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and claims 2-5 and 13, which depends from claim 1, are patentable over Arias et al. in view of Schmokel in view of Sinclair et al. as set forth above. Further, Applicants submit that claims 6-8 and 12, which depend from claim 1, are patentable over Arias et al. in view of Schmokel in view of Sinclair et al. further in view of Vernon. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

In summary, the rejection of the claims under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the cited art has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is requested. Please contact the undersigned should there be any questions or in order to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

September 17, 2010
Date

By: /Janet A. Kling/
Janet A. Kling, Reg. No.: 53,142
Telephone No.: 512-984-5364

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833